S/N 09/186,81

N THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Mark Rapaich

Examiner: Lun S. Lao

Serial No.:

09/186,817

Group Art Unit: 2643

Filed:

November 5, 1998

Docket: 450.183US1

Title:

MULTIPLE AUDIO DACs WITH PC COMPATIBILITY

RECEIVED

PATENT

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

OCT 0 8 2002

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Technology Center 2600

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action mailed on <u>April 25, 2002</u>. Please amend the above-identified patent application as follows.

This response is accompanied by a Petition, as well as the appropriate fee, to obtain a two-month extension of the period for responding to the Office action thereby moving the deadline for response from July 25, 2002 to September 25, 2002.

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on <u>April 25</u>, <u>2002</u>, and the references cited therewith.

The claims have not been amended. Please see the appendix for a copy of the pending claims. Claims 1-13 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 9, 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cooper (US 5,592,508). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 recites routing "based on desired converter quality". No such teaching is found in Cooper. Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ 2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991). It is not enough, however, that the prior art reference discloses all the claimed elements in isolation. Rather, "[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist &

tootzzg Sty gaz